AN ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION OF THE MAJOR PSYCHOLOGICAL CONCEPTS FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR-COUNSELOR

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

Appalachian State Teachers College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

R. H. Methvin

May 1960

AN ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION OF THE MAJOR PSYCHOLOGICAL CONCEPTS FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR-COUNSELOR

by

R. H. Methvin

Approved by:

Clarence A. Carder
Chairman of the Thesis Advisory Committee

Erastus Williams
Director of Graduate Study

J. Paul Bagley
Major Professor

Leo Reynolds
Minor Professor

AN ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION OF THE MAJOR PSYCHOLOGICAL CONCEPTS FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR-COUNSELOR

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

Appalachian State Teachers College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

R. H. Methvin

May 1960

AN ABSTRACT

The purpose. Since most of the psychological literature has been written for the professional psychologists and it requires the acquisition and retention of an abundance of technical terms, it was felt that it was impractical for the religious educator-counselor to be encumbered with such a task who is not necessarily a professional. Consequently, it was the purpose of this study to aggregate into one definition, in nontechnical language, all the important elements found in the definitions of personality, self, and behavior in the various schools of psychological thought.

Procedures used. The survey method was used throughout the study, choosing those proponents who were the most explicit in each case. When the survey was complete, it seemed that all the various theories were appropriately categorized into four schools of psychology--the Phenomenological, the Developmental, the Psychoanalytical, and the Constitutional.

These four schools of psychology seemed to encompass all the major factors in the study of personality in current literature.

The summary. Six areas were found to be important in the study of personality: (1) the definition of personality, (2) the development of personality, (3) the polar tendencies within the personality, (4) the self, (5) consciousness and unconsciousness, and (6) behavior. From these six areas, there were three definitions aggregated, in nontechnical language, which were: (1) a definition of personality, (2) a definition of the self, and (3) a definition of behavior.

It was concluded that neither of the systems studied--the Phenomenological, the Developmental, the Psychoanalytical, nor the Constitutional--offered a satisfactory or all inclusive definition. All the factors mentioned in each of the systems seemed important to provide a complete description of the individual and his behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMINOLOGY

It should be expected in the formative years of any science that there would be some confusion and inconsistencies. Psychology has been no exception, especially for the layman and the nonprofessional. Since most of the psychological literature has been written for the professional, it is logical that it would incur some undue criticism from the general public.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study (1) to combine the various elements of personality in the different schools of psychology into one aggregate definition, and (2) to clarify technical terminology for the lay public, especially the religious teacher-counselor.

Importance of the study. For the professional, the acquisition and retention of an abundance of technical terms is no problem; but for the layman, or nonprofessional, this would, at least, be impractical. Consequently, such a study, combining into one defini-

tion all the elements found in the various definitions of these different schools of psychological thought in nontechnical terminology, seemed justified.

Limitation of the problem. This study has been limited to four schools of psychological thought--the Phenomenological, Developmental, Psychoanalytical, and Constitutional. The reason for the limitation of the problem to these four schools of psychology was that they seemed to encompass all the major factors in the study of personality in current literature. At least, it seemed to categorize most of the concepts appropriately.

The writer was aware of a large variety of what he has chosen to designate as "subdivisions" of these major categories or schools of thought. It seemed superfluous, however, to include the "subdivisions" with the "divisions". Other theories, it appeared, are contributors to the four schools of thought mentioned above, or are combinations of one or more of them.

The writer, also, felt justified in quoting from a relatively few proponents of the four schools of thought, choosing those which he thought were the

more explicit. This view is held since an abundance of words does not necessarily clarify a given problem.

II. DEFINITIONS

In as much as each system of psychology maintains its own set of definitions and that they have been found to vary with the system, it was felt that each definition should be stated as it was needed in the review of literature in that particular system under review. This was especially needful, it was felt, since inconsistencies of definitions have been found between the systems studied. However, in this paper, school of psychology and school of thought are used interchangeably.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

This study was not intended to exhaust all the small variations in the field of psychology, but rather, it was limited to the major classifications. In the mind of the writer, it would have been superfluous to have gone into all the minutia that the subdivisions in the major categories offer, since all the other theories seem to dovetail into the four categories mentioned above. The reader is asked, therefore, to

look for an analysis of these four major divisions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An abundance of literature is extant on the various psychological concepts and some have attempted to set forth categorically the various theories, but to the knowledge of the writer, there is nothing identical with the problem posited above.

I. LITERATURE ON PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Psychologists have approached the behavior of people from at least two broad frames of reference. One from the point of view of an outsider and the other is from the point of view of the viewer himself. The phenomenological approach to psychology seeks to understand the behavior of the individual from his own point of view, not how someone else thinks he perceives something or how another would respond to a certain phenomenon, but how the behaver himself perceives and responds to it in a given situation, or how "things" 'seem' to him. "This frame of reference has been called the 'perceptual', 'personal', or 'phenomenological' frame of reference...."[1]

---

[1]A. W. Combs, and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior (New York: Harper and Brothers; 1959), p. 16.

This perceptual approach to behavior postulates that people do not act or behave according to what others see or would do but according to what the behaver perceives, or as they seem to him at the time of action. What an individual perceives, therefore, is his governor. This is to say that he cannot act differently if he so desired. He is the "victim of his circumstances" as he perceives them and acts accordingly.

The basic concept of this theory then is, as Combs and Snygg state it in their book, Individual Behavior, "The concept of complete determination of behavior by the perceptual field is our basic postulate."[2] Here, at once, we find determinism and lawfulness in every action, whether it be crime or a benevolent deed. As the behaver sees the action, it is purposeful and meaningful. It was the only recourse of action at the instance of behavior. From the behaver's point of view it follows, then, as Professor Combs states, "All behavior, without exception, is completely determined by, and pertinent to, the perceptual field of the behaving organisms."[3]

---

[2] Ibid., p. 20. [3] Ibid.

What is meant by the perceptual field requires definition before we can proceed. The perceptual field is the organization of the relationships of all one knows, senses, or perceives in any way. Or, as Combs says:

> By the perceptual field, we mean the entire universe, including himself, as it is experienced by the individual at the instant of action. It is each individual's personal and unique field of awareness, the field of perception responsible for his every behavior.[4]

The perceptual field and phenomenal field are used synomonously to avoid repetition.

The phenomenal field. The phenomenal field is understood, as in modern science, to have "at least four properties: stability, fluidity, intensity, and direction."[5] This concept is illustrated well with iron filings and magnet in the physical sciences. The same principle is at work in the perceptual field.

The perceptual field is in constant change. As this field fails to retain any given composition because of some added stimuli, and this is almost constantly happening, it is considered fluid. Without

---

[4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

this change in the individual's field, his ability to adjust to the changing circumstances in which he lives and to find need-satisfaction would be impossible. "The capacity for change in the perceptual field also makes learning, reasoning, remembering, forgetting and creativity possible."[6]

The ability of the individual to keep organized in the midst of this constant change is known as stability. If too rapid a change occurs in the perceptual field it may cause disorganization. Organization is a composition or a configuration of all the tangible and intangible objects, details, and meanings which are present in the phenomenal field at any one time.

Organized change is known as direction. Although the field is modified from time to time, as well as the objects in any given situation, the phenomenal field always has meaning and purpose. However, it is the modification of this field that changes the behavior of the individual.

The immediate awareness of a need or problem and the intensity of the stimuli projected on the organiza-

---

[6] Ibid.

tion of the perceptual field are revealed and the behavior of the individual.

The immediate awareness of a need or problem and the intensity of the stimuli projected on the organization of the perceptual field are revealed and affect the behavior of the individual. "What is perceived is always a function of the individual's need operating in an organized field."[7] The news of sickness of one of one's relatives will certainly affect the behavior of the individual much quicker than the news of the sickness of a mere acquaintance.

The phenomenal self and self concept. Within the perceptual field is included every perception possible to the individual. This includes the phenomenal self and the self concept. "By the phenomenal self is meant the individual's own unique organization of ways of regarding self; it is the Gestalt of his concepts of self."[8] This Gestalt or configuration of self may be called myriad because the perceptions one holds concerning himself are without number. "This organization of all the ways an individual has of seeing himself we call

---

[7]Ibid., p. 25. [8]Ibid., p. 126.

the phenomenal self."[9] It is from this phenomenal self and its relationships to events and objects that they acquire meaning.

The phenomenal self may and does change to meet the situation, but the self concept represents for the individual his generalized self which is more stable.

> "Raimy, who first defined the self concept in 1943, said of it: 'The Self concept is the more or less organized perceptual object resulting from present and past self observation, . . . (it is), what a person believes about himself. The self concept is the map which each person consults in order to understand himself, especially during moments of crisis or choice.'"[10]

It is this self concept which provides one a basic frame of reference and from which all else is observed and compared. For example, one is fat if he is fatter than I.

The basic needs. As we have seen, the phenomenal self is an organization of the concepts one has about himself. The drive to maintain this organization of the self seems to be the primary purpose or goal of life. When something challenges or endangers this organization, an immediate defense is erected for

---

[9] Ibid. [10] Ibid. p. 127.

the maintenance of the former concept of the self, or to remain organized while a change in the self concept is being made. Whether or not a change in the concept is brought about seems to be dependent upon at least three factors. These are:

1. The place of the new concept in the individual's present self organization.
2. The relation of the new concept to the person's basic need.
3. The clarity of the experience of the new perception.[11]

Although the basic need of the individual seems, then, to be the maintenance of the perceptual self, this is not the end result. He is constantly seeking his personal worth, the enhancement of the self, or an adequate personality, i.e., that which I call "I" or "Me".

Personal adequacy. The feeling of personal adequacy is, according to Combs and Snygg, more than personality adjustment; it gives one the feeling of being able to cope with life's problems, seeing oneself in positive ways, and the ability to accept oneself and others. Adequate people feel safe and strong enough to meet every challenge of life.

The adequate personality we have defined

---

[11] Ibid., p. 163.

(Combs and Snygg) as one who (1) perceives himself in essentially positive ways, (2) is open to his experience or capable of accepting self and others, and (3) is strongly and broadly identified with others.[12]

II. LITERATURE ON DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

The basic postulation of the developmental theory is that life is made up of a succession of learning processes or developmental tasks. These tasks are compositied of the things a person must learn to be successful in life. If he fails to learn them, he is judged to be unsuccessful and unhappy; properly learned, he is successful and happy.

As Havinghurst defines it:

> A developmental task is a task which arises at or about a certain period in the life of the individual, unsuccessful achievement of which leads to unhappiness in the individual, disapproval by the society, and difficulty with later tasks.[13]

The developmental theory concept professes to possess a position of middle ground between two opposing theories of education:

---

[12] Ibid., p. 366.

[13] R. J. Havinghurst, Developmental Tasks and Education (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1952), p. 2.

> . . . the theory of freedom--that the child will develop best if left as free as possible . . . and the theory of constraint--that the child must learn to become a worthy responsible adult through restraints imposed by his society.[14]

In either case the developmental task is a learning process. Furthermore, it may be seen that the developmental tasks hold a point midway between an individual need and a societal demand. Both of these influence the development of the personality.

Then, to understand human development, one must understand the learning processes. The human being, however, unlike the lower animals which depend upon their instinctive nature, or maturation of "doing what comes naturally," as the theory holds, depends upon the learning processes of development to meet the problems of growing up, or personality adjustment. As Havinghurst points out, "Living is learning, and growing is learning,"[15] therefore, it is vitally important that the learning processes, or developmental tasks be understood.

Nature provides a wide range of possibilities in developing the human body, but the utilization of

---

[14] Ibid., p. V. [15] Ibid., p. 1.

these possibilities depends upon what the individual learns.

> This is true even of such crude biological realities as feeding habits and sexual relations, while the more highly social realities of language, economic behavior, and religion are almost completely the product of learning at the hands of society.[16]

These developmental tasks begin at birth, or even before and continue throughout the life span. This does not mean that learning is:

> . . . one long uphill climb with something to learn every new day, but consists of steep places where the learning effort is severe, and interspersed with plateaus where one can speed along almost without effort.[17]

This concept is illustrated as the little boy masters the art of catching a ball or as the adult learns to operate an automobile. Once the task is learned, the individual performs a given task with ease.

However, the developmental tasks, life's problems, or personality adjustment continue throughout life. The mastery of one task, and the time it is

---

[16] Ibid. [17] Ibid.

learned, is very important to the succeeding ones. For example, if the art of reading is not mastered at the appropriate time, succeeding concepts and arts will be retarded, especially those which require reading skill. Furthermore, studies show that if skills are not learned at the proper time, retardation continues throughout life. A perfect prototype of the developmental task is found in the biological formation of the organs of the embryo.

As the individual grows, he finds himself possessed of new physical and psychological resources. He begins to develop strong legs and other limbs which enable him to walk and manipulate things, and a more complex nervous system which enables him to reason. These, of course, make new demands.

Life becomes more complex as these inner and outer forces continue to set for the individual a series of developmental tasks. These tasks must be mastered, too, if he is to be successful.

Some of the tasks are imposed upon the individual by mere maturation, such as walking, or the

adolescent learning to conduct himself properly with the opposite sex, while others arise from the demands of society, such as learning to be a socially acceptable citizen.

A third source of developmental tasks arises from the personal values and aspirations of the individual, "which are a part of his personality, or self."[18] As the individual develops, he becomes a person in his own right. The personal motives and values of the individual are observed as he makes his own personal choice of occupation or formulates his philosophy of life.

It is seen, therefore, that the personality emerges from a combination of organic and inner and outer environmental forces.

> Thus developmental tasks may arise from physical maturation, from the pressure of cultural processes upon the individual, from the desires, aspirations, and values of the emerging personality, and they arise in most cases from combinations of these factors acting together.[19]

---

[18]Robert J. Havinghurst, Human Development and Education (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1953), p. 4.

Havinghurst in his developmental theory does not define personality as such. He simply refers to its various attributes as developmental tasks--especially the recurrent tasks.

The developmental tasks are somewhat arbitrary, depending upon the society, but arise periodically throughout life, and are divided into six age periods. The tasks for a given period vary depending upon the society and the demands for that particular age period.

III. LITERATURE ON PSYCHOANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY

The basic assumption of the psychoanalytical theory is concerned with both the organic processes and the acts of consciousness. It is sometimes stated as one hypothesis and at other times as two. Freud, at least, stated it in these two ways. As two postulations, he says:

> We know two things concerning what we call our psyche or mental life: firstly, its bodily organ and scene of action, the brain (or nervous system), and secondly, our acts of consciousness, which are immediate data and cannot be more fully explained by any kind of description. Everything that lies between these two terminal points is unknown to us and, so far as we are aware, there is no direct relation between them.[20]

---

[20]Sigmund Freud, An Outline of Psychoanalysis (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1949). p. 1.

As one hypothesis:

> We have adopted the hypothesis of a physical apparatus, extended in space, appropriately constructed, developed by the exigencies of life, which gives rise to the phenomena of consciousness only at one particular point under certain conditions.[21]

There is, however, no real conflict in the assumption (or assumptions) whether it is stated as one or as two.

This position is in opposition to some of the present theories which deny any relationship between the somatic processes and the acts of consciousness. In this regard, Freud says:

> Many people . . . are satisfied with the assumption that consciousness alone is mental, and nothing then remains for psychology but to discriminate in the phenomenology of the mind between perceptions, feelings, intellective processes and volitions.[22]

The problem is, however, as this theory sees it, as Freud states:

> These conscious processes cannot form unbroken series which are complete in themselves; so that there is no alternative to assuming that there are physical or somatic processes which accompany the mental ones and which must admittedly be more complete than the mental series, since some of them have conscious processes parallel to them

---

[21] Ibid., p. 105. [22] Ibid., p. 34.

> but others have not. It thus seems natural to lay the stress in psychology upon these somatic processes, to see in them the true essence of what is mental and try to arrive at some other assessment of the conscious processes.[23]

In the psychical apparatus there are three elements which Freud calls the "id", the "ego", and the "superego". The id is the fountain-head of everything that is psychological and includes all that is inherited and present at birth, the instincts--the reservoir of all psychical energy.

> Freud called the id the 'True psychic reality' because it represents the inner world of subjective experience and has no knowledge of objective reality.[24]

The ego is the organized portion of the id and it comes into existance in order to forward the aims of the id and not to frustrate them and, furthermore, all its power is derived from the id.[25]

The superego is the third and last system of

---

[23] Ibid., p. 34.

[24] Calvin S. Hall and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957), p. 33.

[25] Ibid.

the personality. It is the judicial organ of the personality.

As would be expected each of these elements have distinct functions. The id notifies the person of desires and wants of the instincts. The ego decides or chooses how or in what manner these wants or desires will be satisfied. Hall and Lindzey state it in this way:

> The basic distinction between the id and the ego is that the former knows only the subjective reality of the mind whereas the latter distinguishes between things in the mind and things in the external world.[26]

The id, as the seat of all the instincts, calls for the satisfaction of a particular desire, but the ego, as the executive of the personality and controller of the gate-way to actions, decides what instinctual needs will be satisfied. The superego, as the judicial or moral governor of the personality, is concerned with whether or not something is right or wrong so that it can "act in accordance with the moral standards authorized by the agents of society."[27]

For example, this may be understood when the id

---

[26] Ibid., p. 37. [27] Ibid., p. 35.

calls for the sexual instinct to be satisfied. Now the id will not dictate how it shall be satisfied but only calls for satisfaction. The ego now begins to mediate how this shall be done. The id calls for inner relief and it has no concern for how this is done. Since there are within the id destructive instincts as well as preservative ones, the ego, who is executive or protector of the personality, mediates between the instinctual requirements of the organism and the conditions of the surrounding environment to satisfy these demands and how it might "maintain the life of the individual and to see that the species is reproduced."[28] These two have no concern, furthermore, whether the above mentioned action is moral or immoral. The _superego_ now begins to function and makes judgment concerning the morality of the action. As Hall and Lindzey say:

> The main functions of the superego are (1) to inhibit the impulses of the id, particularly those of a sexual or aggressive nature, since these are the impulses whose expression is most highly condemned by society, (2) to persuade the ego to substitute moralistic goals for realistic ones, and (3) to strive for perfections. That is, the superego is inclined to oppose both the id and the ego, and to make the world over into its own image.[29]

It must not be understood that, while there

---

[28] _Ibid_. [29] _Ibid_.

seems to be constant conflict between these somatic elements, this conflict is disorganizing to the personality, at least, it should not be. In fact the proper functioning of the three, that is a satisfying functioning of the three jointly is fundamental to mental health.

In the above postulation lies the basis for the hypothesis that the unconscious mental quality or state exists. As Freud points out:

> It explains the supposed somatic accessory processes as being what is essentially mental and disregards for the moment the quality of the consciousness . . . (The psychology of consciousness never went beyond a) broken sequence of events which was obviously dependent upon something else, the other view, which held that what is mental is in itself unconscious.[30]

IV. LITERATURE ON CONSTITUTIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

The basic postulation of this theory is that the development of the individual, or the personality type, is primarily the result of the influences of two sets of components (physical and temperamental components) with three components in each set. The physical components--body structure--predisposes the individual to certain types of activities and associations with those of his own physical type, which in turn develops those

---

[30] Ibid.

characteristics of the individual into a given personality. The temperamental components operate in a similar manner.

Sheldon attempted to support his thesis by studying four hundred college student volunteers (men). His purpose for the study was to test his hypothesis that the morphogenotype (body structure) was the primal cause of behavior and a given temperament type. It is assumed that Sheldon means, or includes personality when he speaks of temperament. This conclusion was reached by what he said in his statement of the problem: "We may ask, 'What are the affects of culture (or environment or learning) upon temperament (or personality or attitudes)?'"[31]

In his procedure, he first photographed his subjects from three different angles and compared them by observation and measurement to establish types. Later, he learned that measuring the subjects proved a better method. Eventually, he established three types (those individuals who had physiques of relative proportions) which he called physical components: the Endomorph, which he claims was derived from the endodermal embry-

---

[31]Wm. H. Sheldon, The Varieties of Temperament (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1942) p. 3.

onic layer; the Mesomorph, which was derived from the mesodermal embryonic layer; and the Ectomorph, which was derived from the ectodermal embryonic layer.

Never had anyone attempted such a vigorous study of the crucial importance of the physical structure of the body. Therefore, constitutional psychology becomes:

> ". . . the study of the psychological aspects of human behavior as they are related to the morphology and physiology of the body" (Sheldon, 1940, p. 1).[32]

While Sheldon seeks the relationship of body structure to behavior and personality and places heavy emphasis upon it,

> . . . he does not consider the development of the individual to be completely fixed by his biological inheritance as represented in the morphogenotype (body structure). Rather, he sees the person as endowed with potentials that set limits upon and molds the possibilities for future growth.[33]

Too, as formerly quoted from the statement of his problem, "'What are the effects of culture (or environment or learning) upon temperament (or personality or attitudes)?'"[34] In this question he leads

---

[32]Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., pp. 338.

[33]Ibid., p. 365.

[34]Sheldon, op. cit., p. 3.

one to think that he may be concerned about this phase of the individual but he never makes a study of it or shows any more concern about it.

Concurrent with these somatic qualities and types which he established were temperamental components which corresponded to a given morphogenotype. Likewise, there were three of these temperamental components: Viscertonia, Somatotonia, and the Cerebrotonia. However unlike the morphogenotype, he does not attempt to establish, at least make a candid statement of their origin, as he did the physical components.

Through the interview method, Sheldon set up a temperament scale listing those traits which were geneous of a particular temperament type. He began with a large number of traits but discarded all which did not congregate or were exclusive of one temperament component. When the study was completed, he had thirty-two traits belonging to each component.

Although none of the traits which remained in the scale were like any other trait which belonged to another component, they did not always have an anti-

thesis. On the other hand, some of them did have polar traits. See the following statement by Sheldon:

> Note that some of the (temperament) traits have polar antitheses, while others do not. A trait like Sociophilia (v-8), for example, has a polar antithesis in Sociophobia (C-8). We sometimes speak of such a trait, together with its antithesis, as a "two-way" trait, meaning by this that light is thrown both on the individual's viserotonia and on his cerebrotonia.
>
> Likewise, a few "three-way" traits appear in the Scale.[35]

In the scale, it may be seen, he selected those traits which were of a pure nature--belonging to only one temperament component. However, there are no individuals who belong exclusively to either one of the physical or temperamental components. Everyone possesses a mixture of these three components, including those traits which have antitheses.

To use the scale in classifying people, he used a weighted score system. Thus an individual may receive a scale score of 2-7-4 or 7-4-3, depending upon the morphogenotype or the temperament components. (The larger the number the stronger that particular component.)

It may be seen, as Hall and Lindzey remark:

---

[35]Sheldon, op. cit., pp. 36-7.

All things considered, it seems safe to say that Sheldon's position revolves more closely about biological determinants of behavior than does that of any other contemporary personality theorist.

. . . . . .

Thus, for present purposes the constitutional psychologist is one who looks to the biological substratum of the individual for factors that are important to the explanation of human behavior.[36]

Sheldon summarizes his study of personality by saying:

We find, roughly, at least four general factors at work in the development of a personality: (1) the total strength of endowment in each of the three primary components, (2) the quality of such endowment, (3) the mixture of the components, or their order of relative strength, and (4) the incompatibilities between morphology and manifest temperament. Of the latter, several subvarieties can be made out and are often encountered in the analysis of personalities having a history of severe internal conflict.[37]

---

[36]Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., pp. 338, 364.

[37]Ibid., p. 11.

CHAPTER III

THE ANALYSIS

This study has seemed to possess great variety both in theory content and approaches to the theory of personality. While some have emphasized one phase of personality, others have placed their emphasis on other areas.

The axiom, "the whole of any entity is greater than the sum of its parts," makes the difficulty of definitions quite apparent. The areas defined in this study have been no exception. As Leeper and Madison remark:

> Definitions cannot rest on a priori decisions, after all. They are supposed to group together those things that have important characteristics in common, and they are supposed to exclude some other important characteristics not shared by examples included under the definition.[31]

The purpose, however, in this chapter has been to analyze the four psychological schools of thought mentioned previously--Phenomanological, Psychoanalytical, Developmental, and Constitutional--giving a sam-

---

[31] R. W. Leeper and Peter Madison, Toward Understanding Human Personalities (New York: Appleton-Crofts, Inc., 1959), p. 22.

pling of one or more definitions from each school in each area studied. It is believed when all the various elements in the definitions from the different schools of thought are aggregated into one inclusive definition, is shall aid the counselor in his understanding of the individual and his work with him.

In the analysis of the four major categories studied, six areas have seemed to be important: (1) the definition of personality, (2) the development of personality, (3) polar tendencies within the personality, (4) the self, (5) consciousness and subconsciousness, and (6) behavior.

I. DEFINITION OF PERSONALITY

Personality definitions appear to be determined primarily by the particular set of concepts of a given theory. Furthermore, any definition formed by a given theory seems to be inadequate for any other theorist. Apparently, one theory emphasizes the biological factors, another does the environmental influences, while still another may include a number of elements in his definition. The reader will observe this as he reads the following data.

Phenomenological theory. The theorist of this

school of thought are known by various names, such as: the Gestalt, Perceptual, Conceptual, and Organizational Psychologists. Whatever the name used, the approach is somewhat the same. The following examples should serve to illustrate this.

To Combs and Snygg,

> Human personality is primarily a product of social interaction. We learn the most significant and fundamental facts about ourselves from what Sullivan calls "reflected appraisals."[32]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The phenomenal self is an extremely stable organization which provides the core of human personality.[33]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> By the phenomenal self is meant the individual's own unique organization of ways of regarding self; it is the Gestalt of his concepts of self.[34]

Leeper and Madison express what they call the dilemma of verbalizing an adequate definition of personality in this way:

> When we try to define the word personality. . . . It is so hard to find an adequate abstract definition that we might well be excused if we declined the task and said merely: ". . . Personality is the respect

---

[32] Combs and Snygg, op. cit., p. 134.

[33] Ibid., p. 131. [34] Ibid., p. 126.

in which . . . (people) differ."

. . . . . .

> Perhaps personality must be considered to be, for the most part, confined to those habits or ways of thought which are directly related to certain emotionally significant aspects in our experience.[35]

The element predominant in personality, to this school of psychologists, is what the individual thinks, his perceptions, concerning himself and the situation at the time he behaves.

Developmental theory. Personality, as such, is not defined by the developmentalists. Rather, various attributes of the personality are referred to as developmental tasks, especially those tasks which are recurrent. A recurrent task is defined as a learning situation, or task, to which "new learning must be added as the task changes during later life."[36]

As Havinghurst points out:

> Living is learning, and growing is learning.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> This is true even of such crude biological realities as feeding habits and sexual relations, while

---

[35]Leeper and Madison, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[36]Havinghurst, op. cit., p. 31

> the more highly social realities of language, economic behavior, and religion are almost completely the product of learning at the hands of society.[37]

The predominant element, the almost exclusive one it seems, is that personality is learned behavior, that is, learned from experience.

There are others who could have been included in this school of thought, the experiential, but since Havinghurst is so explicit his contribution seemed sufficient.

Psychoanalytical theory. The chief proponent of this theory, Freud, does not define personality. He merely analyzes it.[38] However, Symonds in keeping with Freud's theory defines it in the following words:

> Personality is the portrait or landscape of the organism working together in all its various phases. It includes the intellectual level, and the types of intellectual response, the emotional adjustment, the balance of glandular secretions, working together as they do to make the man. In personality we are most concerned with the interworkings, the balance, the relative strengths and weaknesses, rather than with an inventory of specific connections.[39]

---

[37] Ibid., p. 1. [38] Cf. Chapter II, pp. 19-21.

[39] Percival M. Symonds, The Nature of Conduct (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1928), p. 286.

Personality, for the psychoanalysts then, is primarily an innate quality, a somatic predisposition or proneness to certain behavior patterns.

Constitutional theory. No definition of personality was found by the proponents of this theory. However, Sheldon states that there are two different sets of components, the temperamental and physical, which affect the personality, particularly in the development of the personality, which will be discussed later on in this chapter. When he speaks of the temperament traits he seems to mean, or include, personality. This assumption was reached by what he said in his statement of the problem, "We may ask, 'What are the affects of culture, (or environment or learning), upon temperament, (or personality or attitudes)?'"[40] He, also, points out that the body structure type, (the physical components), predisposes the individual to a certain type of personality.

Thus far, the study has shown that a complete definition of personality should contain at least four elements: (1) the concept the individual has of himself, (2) what he has learned through experience, (3) the innate quality, an inner somatic predisposition or proneness to

---

[40]Sheldon, op. cit., p. 3.

certain behavior patterns, and (4) the temperamental and physical components which affect the personality. The reader, however, is asked to wait until the end of the study of personality for a complete definition.

II. PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

In the study of the development of the personality the purpose was to ascertain what the determinants are and how they affect the personality.

Phenomenological psychology. The phenomenologists are consistent with their philosophy of personality in their claims concerning the determinants in the development of personality. The perceptions of the individual play a vital role in the development of the personality, it was found. Combs and Snygg express appropriately their position in the following words:

> Human personality is primarily a product of social interaction. We learn the most significant and fundamental facts about ourselves from what Sullivan called 'reflected appraisals,' inferences about ourselves made as a consequence of the ways we perceive others behaving toward us.[41]

. . . . . .

The family itself, however, is a product and

---

[41]Combs and Snygg, op. cit., pp. 134.

> conveyor of the culture which produced it. Even the world of physical objects into which a child is born are subject to the particular interpretations of the culture, so that the phenomenal self becomes overwhelmingly the product of the culture.[42]

The determinants of personality for the phenomenologists are the reflections or conceptions one has of himself in relation to others.

Developmental psychology. While the developmentalists do not define personality, they do express aptly what the determinants are in its development. They are referred to as developmental tasks as Havinghurst says:

> The personality, or self, emerges from the interaction of organic and environmental forces.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Thus developmental tasks may arise from physical maturation, from the desires, aspirations, and values of the emerging personality, and they arise in most cases from combinations of these factors acting together.[43]

A combination of factors--organic and environmental ones--in their interaction determine the type of personality to be developed.

---

[42] Ibid., p. 141.

[43] Havinghurst, op. cit., p. 4.

Psychoanalytical psychology. Hall and Lindzey commenting on this theory summarized the elements influencing the development of the personality in the following words:

> Personality develops in response to four major sources of tensions: (1) psychological growth processes, (2) frustrations, (3) conflicts, and (4) threats. As a direct consequence of increases in tension emanating from these sources, the person is forced to learn new methods of reducing tension. This learning is what is meant by personality development.[44]

The reactions, or learning to cope with increased tensions is the vital factor in the development of personality for the psychoanalysts.

Constitutional psychology. Some seem to think that Sheldon's position revolves more closely about biological determinants in the development of personality than any other contemporary personality theorist. However, these biological determinants do not completely fix the type of personality the person shall have but endows the person with potentials--his biological inheritance as represented in the morphogenotype--that set limits upon and molds the possibilities for him.[45]

---

[44]Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., p. 46.

[45]Ibid., 364-5.

But let Sheldon speak for himself:

> We find, roughly, at least four general factors at work in the development of a personality: (1) the total strength of endowment in each of the three primary components, (2) the quality of such endowment, (3) the mixture of the components, or their order of relative strength, and (4) the incompatibilities between morphology and manifest temperament.[46]

Since the temperament is almost completely controlled by the morphogenotype, body structure type, the conclusion was reached that the biological factors--the morphogenotype--are the controlling ones in the development of personality.

The determinants of personality development then may be summarized as: (1) the reflections or conceptions one has of himself in relation to others, (2) an interaction of organic and environmental experiences, (3) learned methods of reducing increased tensions, and (4) the interaction of the physiological and temperamental components. These may work with or against each other in the development of the personality. However, what ever the case may be, the interaction or counteraction of these components determine the personality.

---

[46]Sheldon, op. cit., p. 11.

III. POLAR TENDENCIES WITHIN THE PERSONALITY

Personality polar tendencies are of two different types, those which are found to be opposite within two different individuals and those opposite traits which are seen within a given personality. The latter type was the one studied in this thesis.

Phenomenological theory. The theorists in this field offer no statements concerning this matter of polar tendencies within the personality. All the disconcerting factors come from threats from life's situations. "What brings the person to the psychological clinic is not the situation as it is seen by others, but the situation as he sees it himself."[47] This may be seen as the first type mentioned above, between individuals, but the latter was of interest here. What they seem to say is that every individual is a composed unit or personality. This does not mean that he feels "adequate" but that no one "trait" within the personality is ambivalent to another.

Developmental theory. No study of the polar activities of the individual was made by this school of

---

[47] Combs and Snygg, op. cit., p. 238.

thought.

Psychoanalytical theory. The theorists of this school hold strong convictions concerning the polar activities within the personality. Freud has this to say:

> After long doubts and vacillations we have decided to assume the existance of only two basic instincts, Eros and the destructive instinct . . . The aim of the first of these basic instincts is to establish even greater unities and to preserve them thus--in short, to bind together; the aim of the second, on the contrary, is to undo connections and so to destroy things.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In biological functions the two basic instincts work against each other or combine with each other . . . This interaction of the two basic instincts with and against each other gives rise to the whole variegation of the phenomena of life.[48]

In their analysis of Jung's Analytical theory, Hall and Lindzey say he believes:

> . . . that a psychological theory of personality must be founded on the principle of opposition of conflict because the tensions created by conflicting elements are the very essence of life itself. Without tension there would be no energy and consequently no personality . . . Polar elements not only oppose one another, they also attract or seek one another. The situation is analogous to a husband and wife who quarrel with each other yet are

---

[48]Freud, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

> held together by the very differences that provoke the disagreements.[49]

While Freud and Jung held differencies, their premises are basically the same. Ambivalence within the personality is not only held by both of these, but it is held to be necessary.

Constitutional theory. Discussing his temperament scale, Sheldon says:

> Note that some of the (temperament) traits (of personality) have polar antitheses, while others do not. A trait like Sociophilia (v-8), for example, has a polar antithesis in Sociophobia (c-8). We sometimes speak of such a trait, together with its antithesis, as a "two-way" trait, meaning by this that light is thrown both on the individual's viserotonia and on his cerebrotonia.
>
> Likewise, a few "three-way" traits appear in the Scale.[50]

Everyone, according to Sheldon, possesses all three of these temperament traits to a greater or lesser degree, including the polar ones. In this way, therefore, no one is free from ambivalence.

Hall and Lindzey say that virtually all personality theorists, whatever the creed or persuasion,

---

[49]Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., pp. 88-9.

[50]Sheldon, op. cit., pp. 36-7.

assume that the personality contains polar tendencies that may come into conflict with one another.[51] Ambivalence, therefore, has seemed to be a vital factor in the understanding and in defining the personality.

This study of the personality has proved the truth of the axiom formerly stated, "The whole is greater than the sum of its parts." Consequently, the writer holds the opinion that, as the definitions he has studied have failed to describe the whole, this one will perhaps fail to satisfy its readers, also. However, it is believed that an aggregate definition, such as this one, should prove valuable to the religious educator-counselor. Personality, therefore, should include no less than all the characteristics mentioned in the data presented. (The writer assumes that all the definitions presented in this study to be supported with scientific data). It may be concluded, then, that personality be understood to include the complete individual, that is, all that one perceives or conceives as being himself, such as: "I", "me", "my", or "mine" as differentiated from that which is not mine; every innate characteristic, temperament,

---

[51]Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., p. 88.

peculiarity, normality, and every actual and potential behavior pattern, including those learned responses and somatic predispositions which distinguishes him from every other person.

IV. THE SELF CONCEPT

The purpose of this phase of the study was to compile what has been written in the way of definitions of the self concepts in these four schools of psychology, at least a sampling from each of them, and incorporate all the elements found in these definitions into one aggregate definition.

Phenomenological theory. This theory differentiates between two elements, the self and the phenomenal self. The phenomenal self is the more generalized self and includes the self. The following is an all inclusive statement:

> Whatever his way of describing himself, each individual has developed a large number of perceptions. These more or less separate perceptions are called concepts of self. By concepts of self we mean those more or less discrete perceptions of self which the individual regards as part, or characteristic, of his being. They include all perceptions the individual has differentiated as descriptive of the self he calls I or me.[52]

---

[52] Combs and Snygg, op. cit., p. 124.

Being more specific in their differentiation of these two aspects of the self Combs and Snygg say:

> By the phenomenal self is meant the individual's own unique organization of ways of regarding self; it is the Gestalt of his concepts of self . . . We might also call it the perceived self.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> To describe the organization of those very important or central perceptions of self involved in a great deal of the individual's behavior, it is sometimes helpful further to differentiate the perceptual field to include only those perceptions about self which seem most vital or important to the individual himself . . . We call this organization the self concept . . . Whatever these concepts are for any individual they are the very core of personality.[53]

This definition seems to include all that is <u>perceived</u> that belongs to the individual as distinguished from everything and everybody else.

<u>Developmental theory</u>. No definition or discussion by this theory was found.

<u>Psychoanalytical theory</u>. The theorists of this school of thought have written extensively on the self concept, however, the following excerpt summarizes their writings on the subject very well:

---

[53] <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 126-7.

> . . . there are two concepts which need separate terms in order to avoid confusion. Ego refers to the self as object--the self which perceives, thinks and acts--and which would be described by an outside observer . . . The self, on the other hand, is the subjective self as it is perceived, conceived, valued and responded to by the individual himself.[54]

In this definition, there are two aspects in the perception of the self--the self that perceives, that is, the self that does the acting and the self which is perceived.

Constitutional theory. No definition was found in this theory. In fact, there was found no reference to the self as the individual himself sees himself.

In the first of these two descriptions, there is only one aspect of the self--that factor which the individual himself perceives, but in the second which discusses the self there are two, namely: (1) the objective self, that which does the perceiving, and (2) the subjective self, that which is perceived, valued and responded to by the individual himself. But since consciousness is a factor in the discussion of the individual as a being, it seems advisable to postpone the definition until the end of the study of

---

[54]Percival M. Symonds, The Ego and the Self (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. vi.

consciousness and unconsciousness.

V. CONSCIOUSNESS AND UNCONSCIOUSNESS

The conscious and unconscious processes have produced much controversy both among philosophers and psychologists which dates back to Descartes and beyond who reasoned: "'I exist': for if I try to doubt my existence I must know that I doubt; and to doubt, I must exist."[55]

One can quickly see, if he enter the philosophical aspect, the subject would demand a treatise within itself. However, the writer has accepted what has been written on the subject by these schools of psychology and how it affects the self and behavior as the present problem.

Phenomenological theory. Combs and Snygg hold that there is no "unconscious", or subconscious, region. It is, rather, a function of differentiation and levels of awareness. (It will be remembered that the phenomenal field and the perceptual field are used synonymously.) But let them speak for themselves:

---

[55]William E. Hocking, Types of Philosophy (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), p. 195.

> The intensity with which events are experienced in the phenomenal field will be a function of differentiation and levels of awareness. Although the perceptual field includes all the universe of which we are aware, we are not aware of all parts with the same degree of clarity at any moment.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It should not be supposed that all meanings existing in the phenomenal field at low levels of awareness can always be called readily into clear figure, or reported to other people. Not at all![56]

This phenomenal field concept, they expound, or develop, is the figure-ground relationship as the Gestalt psychologists do. It corresponds to what William James calls the "field of consciousness," of which he says:

> The important fact which this 'field' formula commemorates is the indetermination of the margin . . . It lies around us like a 'magnetic field,' inside of which our centre or energy turns like a compass-needle, as the present phase of consciousness alters into its successor.[57]

According to these proponents, consciousness encompasses more than the idea the individual has in the center of his thoughts or perceptions at any moment.

---

[56] Combs and Snygg, op. cit., pp. 27-8.

[57] William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1958), p. 187.

Developmental theory. There was no study made by the theorists of this school of thought.

Psychoanalytical theory. The proponents of this school hold that there is not only an area such as the unconscious, or subconscious, but teach that it is very important in the behavior of the organism. Freud has this to say of both areas, the conscious and the unconscious:

> In the course of our work the distinctions which we denote as mental qualities force themselves on our attention. There is no need to characterize what we call conscious: it is the same as the consciousness of philosophers and of everyday opinion. Everything else that is mental is in our view unconscious. Some processes become conscious easily; they may then cease to be conscious once more without any trouble.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Everything conscious that behaves in this way . . . is therefore better described as "capable of entering consciousness," or as preconscious. There are other mental processes or mental material which have no such easy access to consciousness. . . .
>
> Thus we have attributed three qualities to mental processes: they are either conscious, preconscious, or unconscious. . . . What is preconscious becomes conscious, as we have seen, without any activity on our part; what is unconscious can as a result of our efforts, be made conscious. . . .[58]

---

[58]Freud, op. cit., pp. 37-8.

Freud distinguishes between the conscious and the unconscious saying that anything that is not in the immediate consciousness is unconscious or preconsciousness. James also distinguishes between the conscious and the unconscious but differs somewhat with Freud. Note what he says about the subconscious life, or subliminal life, which he says was first discovered in 1886:

> . . . there is not only the consciousness of the ordinary field, with this usual centre and margin, but an addition thereto in the shape of a set of memories, thoughts and feelings which are extra-marginal and outside of the primary consciousness altogether, but yet must be classed as conscious facts of some sort, able to reveal their presence by unmistakable signs.[59]

Freud and James appear to be in agreement that there are mental processes which are not conscious ones to the individual, that they are beyond the margins of consciousness.

Constitutional theory. No discussion was found on this subject by the proponents of this theory.

There is no consensus of opinion, it will be seen, concerning what is conscious and unconscious.

---

[59] James, op. cit., p. 188.

However, one thing has seemed important. It is generally agreed that there are processes which cannot be classified as perceptually clear concepts at all times. This, has seemed, to be vitally important to the understanding of the personality and the behavior of the individual. As Leeper and Madison contend:

> When we try to understand personality, therefore, we are interested in more than the individual's conscious knowledge and conscious understanding of himself and his personality processes. This does not mean that we lack interest in such conscious awareness in ourselves and others. But it seems as though, if we are to understand and explain the conscious experiences we have, we will have to go beyond our conscious processes into broader areas of our lives.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The question is whether we can really recognize, both in ourselves and in others, that personality may come in considerable part from sources outside of those we are consciously aware of.[60]

To summarize, it will be observed that there are at least two approaches to the subject of consciousness and unconsciousness. The first approach is that all that is perceptual, all that is in the "perceptual field," is conscious, only at varying levels of awareness; there are no unconscious levels. The other approach is that there are both conscious and uncon-

---

[60]Leeper and Madison, op. cit., pp. 26-7.

scious processes in the personality of the individual and especially in his behavior.

The self, much like the personality, is so complex that any definition of it may prove unsatisfactory. Those factors studied, however, have seemed important. Consequently, the self is a composite of all the elements of which he is conscious and unconscious that he possesses, and the organization of the ways the individual perceives himself or is perceived by others as his own as distinguished from everything else and every other person.

VI. BEHAVIOR

The original purpose of this study of behavior was to combine into one aggregate definition all the elements found in the definitions of the various schools of psychology. Since there were found no definitions by any of the theories studied and all approached the subject from the view point of determinants, it was decided to ascertain how behavior was produced, that is, what determinants are operative in behavior patterns.

Phenomenological psychology. Psychologists have approached behavior from at least two broad frames of

references. One from the point of view of an outsider and the other is from the point of view of the viewer himself.

The phenomenological approach to psychology seeks to understand the behavior of the individual from his own view point. The following remarks at least seemed to confirm this assumption:

> It is each individual's personal and unique field of awareness, the field of perception responsible for his every behavior.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . the factors effective in determining the behavior of an individual are those, and only those, which are experienced by the individual at the time of his behavior. These experiences we call perceptions and the entire field of these perceptions we call the perceptual field.
>
> The concept of complete determination of behavior by the perceptual field is our basic postulate. It may be stated as follows: All behavior, without exception, is completely determined by, and pertinent to, the perceptual field of the behaving organism.[61]

The prevalent factor in this system, therefore, is what is perceived by the behaver.

Developmental psychology. Developmentalists hold a point midway between an individual need and a societal

---

[61]Combs and Snygg, op. cit., p. 20.

demand. Nature provides a wide range of possibilities in developing the human body, but the utilization of these possibilities depends upon what the individual learns. This seems possible by what Havinghurst says:

> To understand human development, one must understand learning. The human individual learns his way through life. This is true even of such crude biological realities as feeding habits and sexual relations, while the more highly social realities of language, economic behavior, and religion are almost completely the product of learning at the hands of society.[62]

Behavior, consequently, will be a result of an interaction of one's physical potentialities and what is learned through society. What has seemed most important, however, is what the individual learns.

Psychoanalytical psychology. Behavior, the psychoanalysts propose, is determined by the reaction of the individual to the demands of his instincts, the id, the ego, and the superego, however, not exclusively. He also reacts to external stimuli--some societal demands. This analysis was reached on the following and similar statements:

> . . . Individual Psychology is concerned with the individual man and explores the paths by which

---

[62]Havinghurst, op. cit., p. 1.

> he seeks to find satisfaction for his instincts; but only rarely and under certain exceptional conditions is Individual Psychology in position to disregard the relations of this individual to others. In the individual's mental life someone else is invariably involved, as a model, as an object, as a helper, as an opponent, and so from the very first Individual Psychology is at the same time Social Psychology as well--in this extended but entirely justifiable sense of the word.[63]

The important factors in this system, therefore, are those internal drives--instincts--which demand satisfaction. Behavior has seemed to be, then, a reaction to the demands of this internal stimuli.

Constitutional psychology. It is believed by some that the constitutionalists' position offers a more clear exposition of the importance of the physical body structure as a primary determinant of behavior than any other system. The following excerpts offer basis for such an assumption. Constitutional psychology, then, becomes:

> ". . . the study of the psychological aspects of human behavior as they are related to the morphology and physiology of the body" (Sheldon, 1940, p. 1). . . . Thus, for present purposes the constitutional psychologist is one who looks to the biological substratum of the individual for factors that are important to the explana-

---

[63]Sigmond Freud, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (London: The Hogarth Press, 1949), pp. 1-2.

tion of human behavior.

. . . . . .

> In Sheldon's theory we find a clear and vigorous exposition of the crucial importance of the physical structure of the body as a primary determinant of behavior.[64]

The primary factor as a determinant of behavior for the constitutionalists is the physical structure of the body--the biological--which limits the activity in which an individual may participate.

The determinants of behavior fall into two major categories--biological and experiential. However, each of these categories have divisions. To illustrate, the phenomenologists hold that behavior is determined by what is perceived, while the developmentalists say behavior is determined by what has been learned since everything has meaning only in terms of former experiences. The biological determinants also show a difference within themselves when comparing the constitutional and psychoanalytical systems of psychology. The psychoanalytical system holds that behavior is determined by the desire for satisfaction or reaction to the internal drives--instincts, while the constitutional system says it is

---

[64]Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., pp. 338, 344.

determined by the limitations of response the physical structure imposes upon the individual.

Other systems use or include one or more of the above mentioned determinants of behavior. Catell's theory or conception of the traits which determine behavior is an example. He includes both the enviromental influences and the hereditary factors, to which he refers as Metaergs and Ergs respectively. However, it is not to be understood that he includes all the divisions of the two major categories of behavior in his theory.

In conclusion, it was assumed that all these determinants play a role in behavior. Therefore, behavior is the result of all these factors working together; it is a response, a reaction to all the perceptions, the internal drives--instincts, the limitations of the physical structure, and the learned behavior patterns which an individual may possess or acquire during a life time.

CHAPTER IV

THE SUMMARY, FUNCTION, OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study has proved to possess great variety both in theory content and approaches to the theory of personality. While some have emphasized one thing others have placed their emphasis on other areas.

THE SUMMARY

What has seemed important in this study is that the whole of personality is greater than the sum of the areas included in the psychological systems studied; that no definition has seemed adequate, including the aggregate definition of this paper. However, the four major psychological concepts--Phenomenological, Psychological, Developmental, and Constitutional--it was believed, have produced six areas which have seemed to be important in the definition of personality. The six areas studied were: (1) the definition of personality, (2) the development of personality, (3) the polar tendencies within the personality, (4) the self, (5) consciousness and unconsciousness, and (6) behavior.

From the various definitions within the six areas

studied in the four major schools of psychology three definitions were aggregated (a definition of personality, the self, and behavior), which, it is believed, will be helpful to the religious educator-counselor in understanding the individual and his work with him without having to acquire the technical knowledge of a professional.

In the definition of the personality, it was concluded that the personality be understood to include the complete individual, that is, all that one perceives or conceives as being himself, such as: I, me, my, and mine as differentiated from that which is not mine; every innate characteristic, temperament, peculiarity, normality, and every actual and potential behavior pattern, including those learned responses and somatic predispositions which distinguishes him from every other person.

An aggregate definition of the self, much like the personality, is very complex. However, from the factors studied, the self was found to be a composite of all the elements of which the individual is conscious and unconscious that he possesses, and the organization of the ways the individual perceives himself or is perceived by others as his own as distinguished from every-

thing else and every other person.

It was assumed that a composition of the determinants found in the systems of psychology were important in the role of behavior patterns. Therefore, it appeared that behavior is the result of all these factors working together; it is a response, a reaction to all the perceptions, the internal drives--instincts, the limitations of the physical structure and the potential and learned behavior patterns which an individual may possess or acquire during a life time.

In conclusion, it is not assumed that these aggregate definitions are an attempt at producing a new theory. To the contrary, this thesis, it is hoped, may be used as a hand book by the religious educator-counselor in an understanding of the individual and his work.

II. FUNCTION

In view of the importance of an adequate personality for achievement in life, it is felt that the religious educator-counselor should be familiar

with an all inclusive definition of personality, the self and behavior, as proposed by this thesis. He should be cognizant of the various aspects from the many areas in the personality before any type of counseling is begun. These areas include such aspects as the biological and experiential determinants, the polar tendencies within a given personality, the learned behavior patterns and the ways an individual may perceive himself in reference to others. By acquiring such a compilation of facts, the religious educator-counselor could tackle the problem of maladjustment.

This study, therefore, should help the religious educator-counselor to prevent or diminish maladjustment more scientifically, rather than by haphazard methods, than it could be done otherwise. It should help him in the following ways and factors:

1. By knowing the possible limitations of a given personality type, he would have a basis for providing the counselee with adequate help, in keeping with the counselee's possibilities.

2. Enable him to detect an unbalance of polar tendencies, such as sociability.

3. Enable him to give guidance in the various areas in the development of an adequate personality.

4. By realizing that apparent antagonistic behavior is not just wanting to be "mean", but rather it may be caused by a feeling of inadequacy, the counselor shall be able to discover more easily the real cause for the maladjustment.

5. Finally, this "bird's eye view" of the individual should assist the religious educator-counselor to understand that maladjustment often comes from unconscious processes. This is vitally important in counseling the individual.

It is assumed also that these are not the only "helps" this study will be to the religious educator-counselor. Rather, it is hoped that it will be self suggestive in many other ways to him.

III. OBSERVATIONS

The writer would like to submit the following observations:

1. While there has been what seemed to be dogmatic tenacity to one or two determining influences in a given psychological system in an explanation of behavior and personality, there also seems to be a

trend in the direction of including more determinants in the definitions of behavior and personality. This, it is hoped, is true and is a step in the right direction of a complete picture of an individual and his behavior.

2. Personality definitions seemed to conform to the particular philosophy of the theorist. For example, Freud adhered to the prevelant naturalistic philosophy of his day as basis for his definitions and his basic postulations.

3. The determinants of personality may be relegated to a few categories, namely: the biological, the experiential, the social, the motivational, and the spiritual influences.

4. Psychological theories tend to categorize themselves into two major areas--the biological and the experiential--and that the theorists, in the main adhere to their training and background. For example, biochemists adhere to the biological while the sociologists adhere to the experiential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The science of psychology has been one of the major factors toward the elimination of mental illness and, more specifically, a tremendous asset toward better

personality adjustment. However, the task is only begun. Nevertheless, the writer feels further advances could be made in some areas. Hence, the following recommendations:

1. That agreement in terminology, among the psychologists, be attempted and used as the other sciences have done. This would not only help the layman but contribute toward efficiency within the rank and file of professional psychologists. For example, the ego should have one basic connotation.

2. Further, it is recommended that agreement on the basic concepts in psychology be reached, in such areas as what is meant by consciousness and unconsciousness. This should eliminate "quibbling" over terminology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Combs, A. W., and Donald Snygg. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Freud, Sigmond. An Outline of Psychoanalysis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1949.

Freud, Sigmond. (trans.). Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. London: The Hogarth Press, 1949.

Havinghurst, Robert J. Human Development and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.

Havinghurst, Robert J. Developmental Tasks and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: The New American Library (Mentor Books), 1958.

Leeper, Robert Ward and Peter Madison. Toward Understanding Human Personalities. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.

Sheldon, W. H. The Varieties of Temperament. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1942.

Symonds, Percival M. The Ego and the Self. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.

Symonds, Percival M. The Nature of Conduct. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

Hall, Calvin S., and Gardner Lindzey. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.

Hocking, William Ernest. Types of Philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.